VONHOFF (C.) Darstellungen von Kampf und Krieg in der minoischen und mykenischen Kultur (Internationale Archäologie 109). Rahden: Verlag Marie Leidorf, 2008. Pp. xviii + 328, illus. €71.80. 9783896464545.

Schwartz, Adam

Published in:
Journal of Hellenic Studies

Publication date:
2011

Document version
Early version, also known as pre-print

This is a long book whose structure could have been refined to preclude repetition; not all topics merit the full discussion they are given. The book's many strengths lie in the careful elucidation of the human experience. However, the study of agency is not merely an end in itself: it is a tool to generate understandings of structuration in wider chronological and regional fields, and to approach historical insights. Despite the broad remit and fresh approach of the book, the novel insights gained remain disappointingly localized.

MICHAEL J. BOYD
University of Cambridge
mjb235@cam.ac.uk

VONHOFF (C.) **Darstellungen von Kampf und Krieg in der minoischen und mykenischen Kultur** (Internationale Archäologie 109). Rahden: Verlag Marie Leidorf, 2008. Pp. xviii + 328, illus. €71.80. 9783896464545.
doi:10.1017/S0075426911000681

This volume, a reworking of the author's doctoral dissertation, addresses the problem of Aegean pictorial representations of combat and warfare, and attempts an assessment of their societal implications. As Vonhoff points out, numerous archaeological studies of this or that detailed aspect of Minoan or Mycenaean combat iconography have been published, but none which attempts a synthesis. Vonhoff's monograph is an attempt to fulfil this need.

The first ten sections form a systematic description of the archaeological material: each section deals with one category of artefacts (glyptography, wall-painting, vase-painting, sculpture, etc.) and progresses chronologically, using four main periods ranging from MM/MH to LM/LH III. Vonhoff thus charts the fluctuating frequency of combat imagery from tenuous beginnings – especially with regard to Minoan art – to a much more developed and varied battle iconography from LM/LH IIIA2 or LM/LH IIIA1. Items discussed are referenced throughout to the exhaustive catalogue in section 19, again subdivided according to artefact categories, and 79 pages of illustrations and maps. Section 11 compares the pictorial representations with actual, preserved Aegean weapons, and finds a considerable degree of chronological correspondence between both offensive weapons and helmets (including the celebrated boar's tusk helmet; 178–79) and their pictorial representations. Section 12 is devoted to a fuller, iconographical analysis with attention to the respective periods: there are fewer and more primitive representations in MM and MH art, and largely restricted to stone carvings, but from LM/LH I–IIA illustrations proliferate, and both material and motif types become much more varied. Section 13 discusses the geographically widespread and persisting phenomenon (at least since MM III/LH I) of military elements in an apparently religious context (processions, cult images, scenes of rituals).

Section 14 deals with the interesting and complex question of the extent of extraneous influence on Aegean combat iconography. Vonhoff maintains that foreign impulses played a very limited role in the creation of the conventions operative in Minoan and Mycenaean combat iconography: to the extent that any such influence is traceable, it is chiefly derived from Near Eastern pictorial conventions, whereas Vonhoff rejects the frequent imputations of Egyptian ancestry to certain Mycenaean chariot-fighting scenes and battle friezes. Section 15 examines the extent to which the artistic conventions of Aegean combat iconography survived into Iron Age Greece, and were continued. Given the sudden and violent downfall of several Aegean societies, it is perhaps less surprising that Vonhoff shows that few elements were apparently taken over wholesale: apart from minor compositional similarities, these consist mainly of Mycenaean naval battle imagery, and even here there are notable differences between actual Bronze Age naval battles and Iron Age ship-borne warriors fighting on deck (such as on the Aristonothos krater), although there is a surprising continuity of ship types. Section 16 attempts to assess the importance and social standing of warriors throughout the period by analyzing their representations in Aegean art, along with the proliferation of weapons in grave finds and Linear B texts dealing with military matters. Judging societal importance by the fluctuating conjunctures of pictorial representations, to say nothing of the randomness of preservation, is a hazardous approach. Nevertheless, Vonhoff is scarcely wide of the mark when he concludes that warriors enjoyed a privileged status in all Aegean cultures, and increasingly so as Mycenaean influence began to assert itself throughout the area; nor in his estimate that crumbling societal structures near the very end of the Bronze Age and concomitant fragmented warfare are reflected in the appearance of warrior chieftains (βασιλεῖς) in contemporary art.

The volume is a solid exposition of a very large subject matter, and a useful and thorough systematization of a sprawling research field. Vonhoff displays a firm grip of the archaeological material and familiarity with the scholarship, though it is probably not a cover-to-cover read. The subject matter of pictorial representations of warfare may not be as unspoilt as the introduction seems to suggest (see especially J. Driessen, 'The archaeology of Aegean warfare' and the 'L'iconographie' section in R. Laffineur, *Polemos: le contexte guerrier en Égée à l'âge du Bronze* (1999)), and a minor quibble is the *e silentio* conjecture of pattern books as the basis for formulaic scenes (185, 220). These objections should not detract from the book's overall qualities, however. Its forbidding price probably makes it unattainable for most private buyers, but it should be a welcome addition to any academic library.

ADAM SCHWARTZ
University of Copenhagen
schwartz@hum.ku.dk

HODOS (T.) **Local Responses to Colonization in the Iron Age Mediterranean**. London: Routledge, 2006. Pp. x + 264, illus. £23.50. 9780415490986.

doi:10.1017/S0075426911000693

Hodos has set herself an ambitious, panoramic task: the study of local responses to colonization in the Iron Age Mediterranean, combining a variety of categories (written evidence, material culture, artistic designs, etc.). This she consistently applies to the three areas of her research: north Syria, Sicily and North Africa. This approach allows her at once a panoptic vision of patterns and processes, as well as presenting detailed, regional studies, something she masterfully achieves. Hodos follows recent directions in Mediterranean studies, preferring connectivity and dynamic flows over cellular histories of individual regions or city-states, and a network approach that by-passes World System Theory and notions of centres and peripheries. Greece, for her, was no 'core', nor can we observe sweeping relationships of dependency and exploitations in the Iron Age Mediterranean. Rather than seeing cultures unilaterally influencing others she takes the more nuanced position that cultures were being formed and informed by the reciprocal process of colonization and local responses. 'My aim', she says (23) 'has been to provide a flavour of cultural continuities, modifications and re-interpretations as a result of and in response to colonization'.

Hodos has rightly chosen the neutral term 'local' over 'native' or 'indigenous populations', which not only anachronistically denote the perspective of modern colonialism, but also avoid the possibility that the 'locals' were not even native. Hodos works on two interacting levels: the descriptive and analytic archeological survey of local responses to colonization and their theoretical conceptualization. This often works very well, although some lack of clarity remains with regard to the apparent (misleading) equivalence between the major interpretative concepts of Hybridity (following Hommi Bhabba), Middle Ground (following Richard White's sophisticated approach) and 'Mediterraneanization' (following Ian Morris). The latter belongs to the least effective heuristic notions, unnecessarily favoured by historians: like other '-tion' terminology, it assumes less responsibility as it denotes a process rather than a phenomenon, a way to cover more ground while it is not clear when it *ceases* to be applicable. White's Middle Ground reflects the 'third space' of cultural encounters, not mere accommodation, something glossed over by Hodos. On the other hand, she brilliantly observes the simultaneous relativity of Middle Grounds: for example, regions within the control of the neo-Assyrian Empire (dominant military control does not allow for the Middle Ground) might very well have functioned as a Middle Ground *locally* (or rather 'regionally'). Another example: Sicilian populations adopting Greek artistic traits might quickly develop them into their own, 'local', style. This is an excellent point.

Her impressive ability to apply both micro-regional and wide-angle lenses to her observations allows her, rightly, to emphasize *selectivity* of contacts according to time and place, while also observing general patterns: for example Phoenicians adopt things Greek, much less so the other way around; hinterlands facing Phoenicians were less affected than those facing Greeks. This, she says, is perhaps because the Phoenicians themselves were more interested in commerce whereas Greeks sought also agricultural hinterlands. This latter point may indeed explain some of the differences in the patterns of local responses, but one may comment also on the different political culture that produced this difference on the part of the colonizers: acquiring an individual *kleros* for the individual Greek